DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 097 392 UD 014 579

TITLE Intensive Reading Instructional Teams, 1973-1974. Hartford Moves Ahead: An Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION Hartford Public Schools, Conn.
PUB DATE 74
NOTE 46p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Curriculum Development; Decoding (Reading); Demonstration Programs; *Elementary Schools; Individualized Instruction; *Program Evaluation; Reading Comprehension; Reading Instruction; *Reading Programs; Teaching Methods; *Team Teaching; Urban Schools; Vocabulary Skills
IDENTIFIERS *Connecticut; Intensive Reading Instructional Teams; IRIT

ABSTRACT

Hartford's "Intensive Reading Instructional Team" Program has been a demonstration model for teachers, school systems, and college faculties, nationwide. The general objectives of the program were as follows: (1) to raise the level of achievement of pupils who are deficient in the basic skills of language and reading; (2) to improve the self-image of the pupils through approval for any achievement and to provide an atmosphere of mutual self-respect; (3) to develop an appreciation for and pleasure in reading; (4) to investigate techniques and materials which will assist teachers in more effective teaching of reading; (5) to create materials and operate a model demonstration center for the teachers of Hartford; (6) to provide a flexible environment that promotes individualized instruction geared to the learning styles of each pupil; (7) to develop a learner who is self-motivated; (8) to teach to the strengths of each child's learning style and provide remediation for his learning weaknesses; and, (9) to promote an interest on the part of parents in the importance of school-home relationships. The successful departmentalized structure was continued the last year. This design included intensive reading emphasis in three areas--decoding, individualized reading, and vocabulary and comprehension skills. Pupils received approximately one hour of instruction daily in each of the three areas. (Author/JM)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED 097092

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

HARTFORD MOVES AHEAD

An Evaluative Report

ED 097092

HARTFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS·249 HIGH STREET·HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06103

ED 097392

INTENSIVE READING INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

1973 - 1974

Evaluation Office
Hartford Public Schools
Hartford, Connecticut
September 24, 1974

PREFACE

The narrative portions of this report once again were prepared from materials which were collected and submitted by Mrs. M. Beatrice Wood, Hartford's Assistant Supervisor of Reading and IRIT coordinator.

Robert J. Nearine

September 24, 1974

INTENSIVE READING INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

IRIT

1973-1974

OVERVIEW

Hartford's Intensive Reading Instructional Team Program has continued to demonstrate that learning to read is not only fun, but is highly rewarding as well. This U.S.O.E. cited program, in its ninth year of operation, has been selected as one of six compensatory programs to be packaged for dissemination throughout the country. R.M.C., a research corporation, is developing these packages for U.S.O.E.

These three teams provided intensive reading instruction to approximately 410 pupils for the 1973/74 school year.

A fourth center provided comparable services for 135 pupils from Hartford's non-validated schools. These Centers have blended their instructional philosophy with the goals of Hartford '74 - individualized instruction, the development of self-directed learners and accountability, to a workable, implementable project. This project has been a demonstration model for teachers, school systems, and college faculties, nationwide. Test scores of Hartford pupils continue to reinforce the concept that we are "over the hump", and measurable gains are reflected in our test scores. I.R.I.T., with its impact on pupils and teachers, must be considered as an important factor in this gain.

As in previous years, the IRIT Program included objectives that included both the affective and the cognitive domain, because we are increasingly aware of the importance of the affective domain. (See attached Appendix for Behavioral Objectives and Achievement Statistics.)

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

A. General Objectives

1. To raise the level of achievement of pupils who are deficient in the basic skills of language and reading.

2. To improve the self-image of the pupils through approval for any achievement and to provide an atmosphere of mutual self-respect.

3. To develop an appreciation for and pleasure in reading.

4. To investigate techniques and materials which will assist teachers in more effective teaching of reading.

5. To create materials and operate a model demonstration center for the teachers of Hartford.

6. To provide a flexible environment that promotes individualized instruction geared to the learning styles of each pupil.

7. To develop a learner who is self-motivated.

8. To teach to the strengths of each child's learning style and provide remediation for his learning weaknesses.

9. To promote an interest on the part of parents in the importance of school-home relationships.

CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF STUDENTS FOR I.R.I.T.

1. Pupils should be recommended who are below grade level in reading achievement, and are not achieving up to expectancy.

2. Children must be able to work successfully within an intensive program and are able to respond cooperatively in this type of situation.

3. Pupils should not be recommended for the program who are attending the ESL, Bi-Lingual, or IIC program.

4. Experience has indicated that preference should be given to students who have a good attendance record.

5. Guidelines to be used for the selection of students should include information found in the cumulative folders, teacher evaluations and principal and reading consultant recommendations.

6. Teachers are requested to recommend for evaluation as many students as they feel would benefit from this type of instruction. However, it must be clearly understood that it is not always possible to accept everyone recommended for the program at any one time.

(See Behavioral Objectives in Appendix)

DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM ACTIVITIES AND SERVICES

The successful departmentalized structure was continued the last year. This design included intensive reading emphasis in three areas - decoding, individualized reading, and vocabulary and comprehension skills. Pupils received approximately 1 hour of instruction daily in each of the three areas. They returned to their sending schools for the afternoon, where they received instruction in other basic areas. An electic approach to reading is provided through these three areas of concentration. Their design is as follows:

1. Decoding and Word Attack Skills

The purpose of the decoding area is to provide the sound-symbol knowledge that will enable a pupil to successfully unlock or decode an unknown word. In order for students to become efficient readers, they must have independent methods of word analysis. The specific skills in decoding must be isolated and taught. These skills are integrated within the other two areas and provide a balanced reading program. Pupils were taught within all possible classroom groupings. Small group teaching proceeded according to commonality of pupil needs. There was flexibility in that certain lessons were required and others allowed for freedom of choice within certain latitudes. Teacher controlled contracts and record keeping allowed the maximum use of the teacher as a director and guider of individualized instruction. Diagnosed needs and strengths of students provided the framework of the pattern to be followed. Individualized Study Units were developed to encourage the pupil to work in a more self-motivating and responsible environment. Materials which provided sequentially organized skills were used to develop word attack ability.

Some of the materials used were:

1. Phonics Is Fun Books 1, 2, 3 - Modern Curriculum
2. The new Phonics We Use (B to D)
3. The McGraw Kit Second Experiences with Consonants and Vowels
4. Phonics Workbooks A, B, C - Modern Curriculum
5. Dr. Selma E. Herr's Phonics Books 1, 2, 3, and 4
6. Plus 4 Booster published by McGraw Hill (used with more mature pupils)
7. Speech to Print Phonics by Durrell.
8. The Croft Word Attack System.

The language master, typewriter, and tape recorder all assisted in making drill activities more fun and more meaningful to the students.

2. Vocabulary and Comprehension Development

In this area, the pupils received training in reading for understanding. The emphasis was on the understanding of words, sentences, paragraphs, and larger units in this order. Real and vicarious experiences were given to develop an understanding of language. Systematic drill on words was given to provide the pupils with 1.) an adequate sight vocabulary, and 2.) practice in getting meaning through content. Booklets were kept to record new words - expressive sensory words and ideomatic expressions. The use of who, what, where, why, and how in answering questions was used to assist in comprehension development. Some of the materials used in this area were:

1. Barnell Loft, Specific Skill Series.
2. S.R.A. Reading Laboratory
3. EDL Controlled Reader Comprehension Films
4. Reader's Digest Skill Builders with Audio Tapes
5. Instructional Aid Kits by Dexter and Westbrook
6. Teacher-Made Tapes and worksheets
7. The daily newspaper

A multi-media approach was used in order to individualize the program to meet the needs of each student. A new approach was introduced with the use of story cards and work cards. Incentive charts of vocabulary achieve-

ment on which pupils recorded their progress proved to be highly motivational techniques. The student's record was reviewed periodically by the teacher to be sure that pupil needs were being met.

3. Individualized Reading

One of the major goals of the individualized area is to make the reading of books an enjoyable experience for all students and to develop an appreciation for good literature. The students may select their own individual books and read them at their own pace. It is hoped that the more they read, not only will their skill in reading develop, but also the love of books will be encouraged. The pupil-teacher conference is a major technique in this area. This is a very personal conference in which student needs are diagnosed and individual instruction is given.

Books are color coded as to "interest" areas and as to reading levels. Each pupil is placed at his independent level for reading. Teacher instruction is based on the outcomes of the pupil-teacher conference. Motivational bulletin boards encourage wide reading on the part of students.

All three areas are correlated and supplement each other.

SUCCESSFUL OUTCOMES

1. A booklet titled Individualized Reading Ideas for Teachers was developed by the Instructional Staff and was distrbuted to all third and fourth grade teachers in the Hartford School System.
2. For the first time, the Teacher Training Proposal was implemented and 31 teachers of the school system received training in the improvement of their reading techniques. Four weeks were spent in an IRIT Center, and evaluations

written by the teachers and follow-up in their classrooms indicate that the program was highly successful.

3. A display of games and techniques for the teaching of reading was put on for the 1973 NERA Conference.
4. The in-house location of the teams made it possible for the teams to hold both formal and informal discussions and offer immediate help to teachers in diagnosing and planning programs for individual children. Referral by the IRIT resulted in the testing of two 3rd grade pupils who seemed to have emotional and learning disabilities.
5. Each month, the team compiled a newspaper that included the children's original stories, poems, and activities for them to do at home.
6. Because of an increasing interest on the part of the children for books to read at home, we established a lending library. Children from all three cycles borrowed books frequently, and continued to do so after the cycle was over.
7. Almost all of the children in the program reached or exceeded the expected gains in reading skills, based on pre and post test scores.
8. Each of the children made and took home a book of original stories. Each book contained his own stories as well as those of his classmates. This provided opportunities for creative writing and building self-image.
9. During Black History Week, the life story of Harriet Tubman was dramatized by IRIT children. The program was presented to the faculty and children of the Arsenal School.
10. The breakfast program for one group of students proved to be especially successful, because the children appeared to work better after eating; spent

less time being occupied with the consumption of candy and gum; and gained a sense of responsibility for their own needs.

11. The continued practice of taking pictures of the children at work in different activities, and distributing them at the graduation, pleased both parents and students. It also appeared to enhance the self-image of the students.
12. The team staff and Centers served as resources for the teachers involved in Hartford's 3-4 Restructuring Workshop, and served as demonstration centers.
13. A number of field trips were taken to assist in the broadening of pupils' experience; among them were a trip to the planetarium at HPHS; a trip to Forest Park in Springfield, Mass.; a trip to the Hartford Arts Festival. The Jones Center took their students to the library on a regular basis for story-telling and dramatics.
14. Closing Exercises and Open House Day continue to be highlights of the IRIT Program. Parents, teachers, and administrators give high praise to these activities.
15. The reading teams have provided samples of contracts and activities to system teachers to assist them in the individualization of instruction.

PROBLEMS

1. Part-time secretarial service limited the output of professional materials and communications to teachers and parents.
2. Lack of funds for the replacement of worn out equipment and the delay in repairing defective equipment continues to be a major problem.
3. The identification of a suitable test for the urban youngster is still needed for adequate evaluation.
4. One Center lacks proper storage space and the classrooms are small.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Continuation of the Intern Teacher Training Program to give additional teachers improved knowledge and techniques in the teaching of reading.
2. Additional funding to replace worn A/V equipment.
3. A full-time secretary for each Center.
4. Additional funds for materials for the Inter teachers.
5. Improvement of the professional library in each Center.

EVALUATION

Continuing with an on-going pattern, the evaluation of the IRIT program once again employed several kinds of product assessments. Most of these were continued from previous years in an attempt to provide longitudinal depth to the evaluation while others were eliminated from the assessment inventory.

Ultimately, several kinds of data were collected. To assess reading gains over the length of each instructional cycle, the reading sections of the California Achievement Test (CAT), sometimes called the California Reading Test, and the Botel Word Recognition Test were administered on a pre and post cycle basis so as to produce measures of change in vocabulary, reading comprehension, and total reading. The CAT was used so that the 1973-74 scores could be compared with previous cycles while the Botel served as a diagnostic measure. In addition, since all youngsters now receive an end of the school year assessment with the Metropolitan Achievement Tests, it was also possible to examine reading retention as well.

In addition to the cycle CAT and year long MAT testing, evaluation forms were also prepared for the use of the parents and teachers of children who had been served in the program. In addition, and as a part of a statewide compensatory evaluation, the youngsters who were enrolled in the one spring IRIT cycle also received a "happy face" Scale to Measure Attitudes Toward Reading as well. Given to the IRIT youngsters in May of 1974, this Scale was also administered to another group of Hartford youngsters who

had been kept in a sending classroom for reading, but without IRIT supplementary instruction.

As the final element in the evaluation, IRIT teams had long recognized and through previous evaluative studies, that the instructional objectives which had been specified in the project narrative were hardly amenable to measurement by any one instrument. Since these were intended for mastery on an individualized basis, objectives had to be assessed by various teacher-developed criteria. These criteria were listed on a check sheet and were separated in terms of the numbers of youngsters who had reached each specific objective, who exceeded the objective, or failed to meet the standard. Ratings were then converted to percentages and reported in the evaluation.

Because a summative evaluation attempt to look at several aspects of the IRIT program, a number of analyses were attempted; for the program as a whole, on a center by center basis and in various combinations of these factors. These were completed so as to enable the reader to answer for himself a basis evaluative question; were youngsters reading better following the IRIT services? Specific answers to this question can be reported as follows:

1. In common with the pattern established in preceding years IRIT services focused on youngsters at the middle third and fourth grade levels. Data on 532 individuals was examined, with only those youngsters

who had received both pre and post testing considered in the analysis. While a total of 545 youngsters received IRIT services, 532 youngsters had some pre or post test data a figure representing about 98% of the whole.

2. When the CAT data were analyzed on a center by center basis as expected pre and post test differences at each of the four IRIT centers were statistically significant and at the .01 level of confidence. Specific sub test gain scores for each of the IRIT centers are reported in the table which follows. Note here that the Harris team, while located in a validated school, is supported by general funds and serves a non-validated albeit educationally deprived population. Note also that gains patterns were comparable to those reported during the previous year.

		Vocabulary			Comprehension			Total Reading		
Team	N	Pre GE	Post GE	Dif. GE	Pre GE	Post GE	Dif. GE	Pre GE	Post GE	Dif GE
Harris	131	2.8	3.4	+ .6**	2.5	3.1	+ .6**	2.6	3.3	+ .5**
Jones	130	2.4	3.3	+ .9**	2.2	3.0	+ .8**	2.3	3.2	+ .9**
Wish	129	2.2	3.3	+1.1**	1.8	3.4	+1.6**	2.1	3.4	+1.3**
Clark	129	2.5	3.5	+1.0**	2.1	3.3	+1.2**	2.4	3.4	+1.0**

** $p < .01$

3. In the past, the same CAT scores were analyzed on a sex basis to see if differences existed. Since differential programing based on sex differences was not contemplated, the analysis was discontinued this year. Instead, score differences were analyzed

on a team and grade basis. Here again all gains were statistically significant at the .01 level. Mean grade equivalent scores reported by team and by grade for the three CAT sub-tests can be seen on the table which follows. Again, gain patterns were comparable to those reported during the 1972 - 73 school year.

Comparison of California Mean Grade Equivalent Scores, by Team and by Grade, 1973 - 1974

Team and Grade	N	Vocabulary Pre GE	Vocabulary Post GE	Vocabulary Dif. GE	Comprehension Pre GE	Comprehension Post GE	Comprehension Dif. GE	Total Reading Pre GE	Total Reading Post GE	Total Reading Dif. GE
Harris										
Grade 3	82	2.5	3.1	+ .6**	2.1	2.8	+ .7**	2.3	3.0	+ .7**
4	49	2.9	3.4	+ .5**	2.6	3.2	+ .6**	2.8	3.3	+ .5**
Jones										
Grade 3	64	3.3	3.8	+ .5**	3.0	3.7	+ .7**	3.1	3.8	+ .7**
4	66	2.5	3.1	+ .6**	2.2	3.2	+1.0**	2.3	3.1	+ .8**
Wish										
Grade 3	89	2.4	3.1	+ .7**	2.2	2.8	+ .6**	2.3	3.0	+ .7**
4	40	2.5	3.9	+1.4**	2.2	3.3	+ .9**	2.4	3.3	+ .9**
Clark										
Grade 3	84	2.1	3.2	+1.1**	1.7	3.2	+1.5**	2 0	3.2	+1.2**
4	45	2.4	3.6	+1.2**	2.1	3.6	+1.5**	2.4	3.7	+1.3**

**P < .01

4. In the past, and despite the fact that overall reading gain patterns were usually quite salutary, it was the usual practice to examine gain differences as these occurred between teams. To do this, a simple one-way analysis

5. In addition to the CAT testing, teams also used the Botel Word Recognition Test on a pre and post cycle basis. A comparison of pre to post gains is reported in the table which follows. Note that all gains are statistically significant at the .01 level.

Comparison of Botel Mean Grade Equivalent Scores,
by Team and by Grade, 1973 - 1974

Team and Grade	N	Pre GE	Post GE	Dif. GE
Harris				
Grade 3	82	3.3	4.9	+1.6**
4	50	4.8	6.0	+1.2**
Jones				
Grade 3	64	3.3	4.9	+1.6**
4	65	3.6	5.5	+1.9**
Wish				
Grade 3	74	3.1	5.3	+2.2**
4	37	3.8	6.2	+2.4**
Clark				
Grade 3	68	3.5	4.9	+1.4**
4	44	4.6	5.7	+1.1**

**P < .01

of variance was utilized so as to examine different combinations of team scores against other combinations. This was done to see if differences in "gain" patterns could better be attributed to program differences or to differences in the student population. While test score differences between teams were statistically significant, program comparisons were inappropriate. Thus in order to avoid fallacious comparisons, differences have not been plotted graphically.

6. In the IRIT proposal, a series of specific individualized program objectives were stated. These were to be assessed on the basis of criterion which were identified by the various teams. These objectives, supporting data indicated that each objective had been obtained and generally with ratings exceeding 90%, and the several attained percentages are shown on the following pages.

Appendix

WRITING AND EVALUATION - - - - CHECK LIST

I. PROJECT TITLE - I.R.I.T. COORDINATOR - M. Beatrice Wood, Assistant Supervisor of Reading

II. OBJECTIVES	Conditions	Task	Standards	Measurable
1	After I.R.I.T. instruction	75% of the pupils will show a growth in vocabulary and comprehension skills	as evidenced in a month's gain in reading achievement for a month of I.R.I.T. instruction.	Yes
2	The I.R.I.T. pupil will	improve his independent reading by	reading two more books each month during the period of instruction.	Yes
3	The pupils will be able to	relate the sound to the symbol of all short and long vowels	with an accuracy of 70%.	Yes
4	The pupils will be able to	relate the sound to the symbol of all consonant letters presented	with an accuracy of 80%.	Yes
5	I.R.I.T. pupils will be able to	identify rhyming words	with an accuracy of 80%.	Yes
6	The pupils will be able to	answer comprehension questions at their level	with an accuracy of 80%	Yes
7	The pupil will be able to	read orally with reasonable fluency	at his level of attainment with an accuracy of 80%.	Yes
8	The pupil will	read a good variety of reading materials	in at least 3 different areas.	Yes
9	The I.R.I.T. pupil will	show gains in vocabulary development	for at least 75% of the pupils.	Yes
10	The pupil will	show a gain in using the study skills taught (index, etc.)	for at least 75% of the students.	Yes

III. COLLECTING INFORMATION

Objective to be Measured #	Instrument and/or Method (How?)	Information Collected (What?)	Collection Schedule (When?)	Analyses (How Used?)	Expected Conclusion (What do You Expect to Show?)
1	California Reading Test	Pupil Achievement in Reading	At the beginning and end of each cycle	To improve instruction	Growth in reading
2	List of books read	The number of books read by each pupil	Monthly and at the end of each cycle	To promote the joy of reading	Increased number of books read
3	Botel - Croft Word Attack	Knowledge of sound symbol relationship	Periodically and at the end of each cycle	To diagnose word attack skills	Improvement in assessment of individual needs
4	Croft Word Attack System	Knowledge of consonant sounds	Periodically and at the end of each cycle	To improve instruction	Improvement in word attack skills
5	Botel Phonics Inventory	Ability to identify rhyming	At the end of each cycle	To identify skills needs	Mastery of rhyming words
6	Teacher-made Tests	Degree of comprehension skills	Periodically and at the end of each cycle	To improve instruction	Improvement in comprehension
7	Informal Reading Inventory	Oral reading fluency	Periodically and at the end of each cycle	To instruct according to needs	Improved oral fluency
8	List of books read	Tastes in reading materials	At the end of each cycle	To provide a wide exposure to pupils	Improved and varied tastes
9	Teacher-made Tests	Vocabulary knowledge	Periodically and at end of each cycle	To instruct according to needs	Growth in vocabulary
10	Teacher-made Tests	Study skills knowledge	At beginning and end of each cycle	To instruct according to need	Growth in study skills

IV. COORDINATING REQUIREMENTS

Who Will Do What?	When?
Testing	
California Reading Achievement Test - The Lower Primary, Upper Primary, or the Elementary will be administered, Forms W and X	At the beginning and end of each cycle of pupils
Botel Phonics Inventory Forms A, B	Periodically and at the beginning and end of each cycle
Croft Word Attack System Forms A, B	Periodically and at the beginning and end of each cycle
Teacher-made Tests and Inventories	As diagnosis reveals the need
Development and the Selection of Instruments	
The selection of the test form will depend on the levels of the pupils	
Analysis of Data	
Mr. Robert J. Nearine	June
Development for Final Report	
M. Beatrice Wood	June

CLARK IRIT

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I.R.I.T. BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVES EVALUATION

Cycle 1 School CLARK Cycle 2 School ARSENAL Cycle 3 School CLARK 1973/1974

Objectives #	Cycle 1 Results			Cycle 2 Results			Cycle 3 Results			Remarks
	Above	At	Below	Above	At	Below	Above	At	Below	
1	40	3	0	39	1	3	43	0	1	
2	42	1	0	43	0	0	44	0	0	
3	43	0	0	43	0	0	44	0	0	
4	33	7	3	31	10	2	37	4	3	
5	43	0	0	43	0	0	44	0	0	
6	33	10	0	43	0	0	42	2	0	
7	33	10	0	36	5	2	41	3	0	
8	30	4	11	33	4	6	36	5	3	
9	43	0	0	40	3	0	42	2	0	

F. O. Jones IRIT

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I.R.I.T. BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVES EVALUATION

Cycle 1 School F. O. Jones Cycle 2 School F. O. Jones Cycle 3 School Barnard-Brown 1973/1974

Objectives #	Cycle 1 Results			Cycle 2 Results			Cycle 3 Results			Remarks		
	Above	At	Below	Above	At	Below	Above	At	Below	Above	At	Below
1	39	3	1	33	4	7	37	1	5	36.3	2.7	4.3
2	32	11	0	32	3	9	41	1	1	35.0	5	3.3
3	40	0	3	35	6	3	33	6	4	36.0	4	3.3
4	35	3	5	38	1	5	42	0	1	38.3	1.3	3.6
5	38	3	2	41	1	2	43	0	0	40.7	1.3	1.3
6	42	0	1	32	8	4	41	1	1	38.3	3.0	2.0
7	43	0	0	44	0	0	43	0	0	43.3	0	0
8	32	6	5	33	5	6	43	0	0	36.0	3.7	3.7
	41	2	0	42	2	0	41	2	0	41.3	2.0	0
	38	3	2	37	5	2	38	4	1	37.7	4.0	1.7

WISH IRIT

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I.R.I.T. BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVES EVALUATION

Year 1973-1974

Cycle 1 School Hooker Cycle 2 School Wish Cycle 3 School Fox Elementary

Objectives	Cycle 1 Results			Cycle 2 Results			Cycle 3 Results			Average	Remarks
	Above	At	Below	Above	At	Below	Above	At	Below		
1	37	2	2	30	10	4	44	0	0	43	
2	39	2	0	31	7	6	43	0	1	43	
3	19	19	3	44	0	0	45	0	0	43	
4	17	21	3	21	21	2	32	11	1	43	
5	41	0	0	41	0	3	45	0	0	43	
6	22	15	4	10	31	3	32	11	1	43	
7	18	18	5	9	35	0	33	10	1	43	
8	41	0	0	31	13	0	43	0	1	43	
9	18	20	3	44	0	0	35	8	1	43	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I.R.I.T. BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVES EVALUATION

Cycle 1 School Burns Cycle 2 School Rawson Cycle 3 School Batchelder 1973/1974

Objectives #	Cycle 1 Results			Cycle 2 Results			Cycle 3 Results			Remarks
	Above	At	Below	Above	At	Below	Above	At	Below	
1	42	2	0	29	3	12	30	1	13	
2	36	2	6	23	5	16	17	16	11	
3	35	2	7	39	2	3	38	0	6	
4	44	0	0	43	0	1	44	0	6	
5	37	0	7	40	0	4	38	0	6	
6	2	40	2	3	37	4	4	3	3	
7	0	43	1	0	40	4	0	40	4	
8	0	44	0	0	44	0	0	44	0	
	42	0	2	38	0	6	36	0	8	
	0	43	1	0	39	5	0	40	4	

7. Highly favorable indications of individualized objective attainment data were further supported by self-reports obtained from parents, referring teachers, and IRIT interim teachers. Data which were compiled by the Reading Department are reported for the IRIT program as a whole.

PARENT EVALUATIONS OF THE IRIT PROGRAM

1) As a parent, did your child enjoy attending the Reading Program?

Much	-	207
Some	-	15
No answer	-	7

2) What did your child like about the reading school?

The variation in tasks

Doing typing

He said he likes the work, the games and the songs you teach him

The teachers - their patience and modern method of teaching

Learning new words and their meanings

Reading books - doing words in syllables & accents

The machines

Everything, but most of all, the kindly teachers. The teachers really were so good

Machines, and the way the teachers teach you how to read, making it an enjoyable experience

She liked working with the teacher

The program, itself

Enjoyed group reading process

The type of work planned for the class

Her choice of books

Tape recording

Doing activities

He liked the prizes every week

To learn to read better and understand what she reads

The language master

To find that he had the ability to read.

3) What did your child dislike about the reading school?

Nothing

Doing the SRA Kit

The language master

She doesn't dislike it at all

Working on papers

4) How has your child's attitude toward reading changed?

She seeks out books to read on her own without anyone urging her.

I find him reading much better and seems to have no problem.

He changed a lot.

She is aware of how much better she can read.

She now reads everything - books, advertisements, papers, etc.

She changed toward reading her books not looking at the pictures. She goes to the library more often.

It really seems to me that she likes to read more and faster. Already she borrowed books from library.

Immensely! Seems confident and will sample almost any book on his reading level.

She loves to read now.

More interest.

She likes and enjoys reading more.

For the better.

5) How has the reading program affected your child's attitude toward school in general?

She likes her other classes but enjoys the reading class a lot better.

I haven't heard him say one time he wanted to stay home. Before, he always wanted to know how many days he would have off or would have to go before the weekends.

5) (continued)

She is now helping her sisters to read better.

The program has also helped to improve her arithmetic, because she can read and understand.

She looks forward to going every day. I think because she can read better.

He is very happy about it.

More interested in school.

Helped her with all school work, and helped her very much with her reading.

He likes to try new words at the MIA and even at home;he feels he has accomplished a new goal.

6) Did you visit the Reading Program?

Yes	- 65
No	- 156
No Answer	- 8

7) How would you suggest that the reading program be improved?

Have reading program entire term.

It should be done in every school to teach a lot of kids to read.

I am very pleased with your program.

Be continued.

By parents who have children in this reading program to come out and help their children more.

A summer reading program.

I think that it is well arranged because Tracy didn't like to read and now she does a lot of it.

TYPICAL TEACHER EVALUATIONS OF THE I.R.I.T. PROGRAM

1) What changes have you noticed in the skills of the children attending the I.R.I.T.? Describe briefly.

More of a desire to read. Better decoding skills.

Improved word attack skills; more confidence in reading.

Less dependence on others - more word attack ability.

Better attention span.

Contented, calmer, happier (seem less frustrated).

They seem to listen more and follow directions; seem to work more independently.

More aware of vowel sounds.

They can read much better and are, therefore, more motivated to do reading assignments.

Very more attentive to detail on the whole.

Better comprehension.

More attempt to "sound out".

2) What changes in the children's attitude toward reading did you notice? Describe briefly.

More enthusiastic and more willing to discuss what they have read.

Children are more eager to take books home at night.

More excited about reading - proud of their accomplishments.

A better attitude - more willing to try.

Some were quite eager to bring in their reading papers to show the teacher their progress.

I see more children with library books and with a desire to use the library.

They're anxious to visit the LRC to check out more books.

More self-confidence in their ability to read.

3) What behavioral changes have you noticed? Please specify.

Children are better able to read independently.

They somehow seem "more settled" and able to work longer on assignments.

Some children began acting more superior.

More control is shown.

Good attention span increase.

More mature, respect for equipment and tools of learning, interest in learning - improved spelling.

More outgoing.

They finish all assigned work.

Deeper concentration on reading.

More cooperative. More self-reliant.

4) Were you able to visit the I.R.I.T. Program to see it in action?

Yes 33 No 30

5) How many pupils remained with you during the A.M.?

Average number = 22

6) What affect did the I.R.I.T. Program have on the children who remained in your classroom?

No noticeable affect.

Although they have been able to receive more of my attention, I think many of them are jealous and would like the opportunity to participate in the IRIT program.

They liked the smaller class.

Less crowded areas; more time spent with individual children.

Were able to advance faster in C.A. packets, received more attention.

The children also improved in skills and word knowledge. I had more time to work with them

6) What affect did removing some pupils from your classroom have on your program?

I have been able to devote more time to the reading and language arts areas for the remaining pupils.

The smaller class was great. I'm able to give more individual attention. Children worked better with fewer children.

None.

Quieter; ran smoothly.

Smaller numbers help to improve the teacher-pupil ratio.

It helped.

We were able to individualize our 3rd grade reading program to a greater extent.

The program remained basically the same; however, we covered much more territory.

Easier to execute.

7) How would you improve the I.R.I.T. Program? Describe briefly.

Try to have it in the school where the children are.

No suggestions.

If possible, include more children.

MIA teachers should meet more often with the IRIT teams.

It is beautiful!

Extend the length of cycle.

Couldn't be better!

Try teaching some of the less achievers.

Set up more centers in the city.

8) How have the pupil progress reports helped you?

Made me more aware of tests available to use.

Helped me to know what they are doing the other 1/2 of the day.

Keep abreast of their progress.

8) (continued)

Helped me to evaluate growth and to plan individual work for the afternoon.

For future placement - saved me many valuable hours.

Enable us to reinforce what is being taught in IRIT.

Very helpful.

Evaluations and reporting to parents.

Pinpoints individual interest, skills, and achievement.

Gave me the exact skills that were developed and the rate of progress.

They have helped in placing the children for next year.

TYPICAL IRIT INTERN TEACHER EVALUATIONS

1) How has participation in the IRIT Program affected you?

It has brought about an awareness of the different aspects of reading, such as the different types of tests and their use; and the program has exposed me to a greater variety of materials.

It has given me a broader view of the entire reading prospective.

I asked to be an IRIT intern because I felt my reading background was insufficient. IRIT has been all that I hoped, and more. This experience has helped me "pull things together". It has made me aware that I knew more than I felt I did in some cases; it has given me countless ideas, offered me instruction in phonics, opened the world of diagnostic teaching to me, and just generally boosted my competence and enthusiasm.

I have learned more and have been exposed to more materials, teaching techniques, etc., than I have ever experienced in any workshop or college course.

I am better equipped to diagnose and prescribe for children who, for one reason or another, have fallen short of attaining a functional reading level.

2) What did you like best about the program?

Being able to ask questions of people in the "know", getting the opportunity to check out the extent of my own ability in the teaching of reading, and getting help in pin-pointing my weaknesses -- and exposure to materials which will strengthen them.

Spirit of cooperation that prevails through every aspect of the program.

The fact that we were involved in the actual planning and actual execution of everything that went on in the Center while we were there.

The complete IRIT team, which presented the total reading experience in such a clear manner was an ideal setting for a true learning experience.

The fact that I learned through observation, conversation with the IRIT teams, and experience in the classroom in a process in which the three interwove with each other in my learning.

The warmth, sincerity and personal involvement of each team member with one another in a relaxed, but very professional way. The very exciting and educational environment provided for children to learn. The tremendous asset of having a limited number of students to work with. The lack of discipline problems.

3) What did you like least about the workshop?

Saturdays and Sundays.

Nothing.

Inventory of Teacher Knowledge.

Requirement of keeping a daily log.

The period of time should have been at least another week or two. More time to gather your thoughts.

4) What suggestions do you have for improving the Intern Program?

More study time, and more training on testing. If possible, a chance to discuss and ask questions about the different articles in our reading notebook. (I think that reading notebook is a terrific idea!)

Perhaps it would be wise to suggest that interns visit the other IRIT centers in the afternoon rather than in the morning when children are there. I see a greater benefit in getting to talk with individuals about their centers in total, rather than catching what is happening "just then".

I found the Intern Program to be excellent as is.

Perhaps interns should have a choice as to what area of the program they need the most help in - and then be allowed to specialize in that area for a longer period of time.

5) Have your skills in reading instruction improved? If so, how? If not, why not?

Very definitely. I feel I have acquired more of an overall understanding of reading instruction - of what must be done when. I am now aware of and know how to use such tools as the IRI and the Botel word recognition, and phonics tests.

Definitely! I have been able to learn new and more exciting ways to individualize my own reading program.

I simply feel more confident and more capable of helping my students learn to read.

Definitely yes. I have a much more thorough understanding of the components of reading instruction. Things that I have previously studied, but never learned. My children will definitely benefit by me being an intern in this program.

I am now better equipped to work more effectively in the areas of decoding and comprehension.

8. An unobtrusive but rather vital indication of program success is the attendance pattern of the youngsters. For the IRIT program, attendance at each center was taken and a percentage of attendance calculated. The resultant figure was considered by teams to be appropriate and an indication of the motivational impact of the program.

IRIT Aggregate Days Attendance	19,386
IRIT Aggregate Days Membership	21,292
IRIT Percentage of Attendance	91.04%

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In order to assess the effectiveness of IRIT program as a total project and on a team by team basis, several kinds of product measures were collected. Some of the measures followed a pattern which had been established over the years during which the IRIT had been in operation, while others were new to the program. Based on the measures which were employed, a number of findings were evident.

1. When youngsters were tested with the California Achievement Test (CAT '53) at the beginning and end of each 8 to 11 week instructional cycle, team gains in vocabulary, comprehension, and total reading sub-tests ranged from .6 to 2.1 with all gains statistically significant at the .01 levels. Gains were comparable to those reported for the same periods during the preceding year.
2. When these same data were analyzed by individual team grade levels, gains ranged from .5 to 1.5 and were again statistically significant. Note that the non-validated Harris team reported gains which were slightly below those reported by the other validated teams.
3. To determine whether the program was operating at about the same level across the board, gains on the various sub-scores were compared on a team by team

basis. While statistically significant differences were reported, no inferences nor conclusions could be drawn from the data.

4. In addition to the use of the CAT, teams also gave the Botel Word Recognition Test on a pre and post cycle basis, mean gains ranged from 1.1 to 2.4 and these statistically significant at the .01 level.

5. As has been previously reported, specific individualized program objectives were stated in the IRIT project proposal. These were assessed on the basis of criteria specified by the various teams. Teams reported that all objectives were attained and these at a rate exceeding 90%. While no levels of expectancy were reported the objectives, supportive data, and the several percentages were reported.

6. Because the IRIT program was oriented toward an individualized instructional approach, various program objectives were specified and these were assessed by team criteria. Data reported here indicated that all objectives were attained and at a rate exceeding 90%. While no level of expectancy was reported, it would appear that the level of attainment was at least anticipated, and was probably exceeded. No

problems in this area were reported.

7. Analyses of the various responses to parent, teacher, and intern self-report forms, coupled to a representative array of comments taken from the same reports again produced overall patterns of program. Once again this satisfaction seemed oriented toward two basic program areas the children's enjoyment of the IRIT program, and the reading benefits which resulted from IRIT attendance. Both areas received strong support. Teachers also reported that their lowered class sizes enabled them to work more effectively with the remaining children to the point that increased reading gains may have occurred in sending classrooms. This area was not specifically measured.

8. As an unobtrusive but vital indication of motivational impact, an appropriate attendance figure was presented by the IRIT program as a whole. Here the percentage of attendance for the 1973-74 school year was 91.04%.

On the basis of the foregoing evidences, once again it would appear that the overall objective of the program - to help inner-city youngsters to read - was met by the IRIT program.

Evaluation Office
October 3, 1974

Date July 9, 1974

1973-74 SADC - TITLE I ESEA PROJECT EVALUATION

Town Hartford, Connecticut

Prgm Director M. Beatrice Wood
Board of Education
Address 249 High Street, Hartford

Prgm Evaluator Robert J. Nearine

Program Title:
Reading Improvement Program

Period of Program:
(x)ach yr only
( )summer only
( )ach yr & sum

Program length in weeks 34

Project Number: 64-1

Program Funds:
SADC: $174,475
Title I: $ 8,150
_____: $ -
(Specify any other)

1. Program Participants

Total public school pupils 410

Total nonpublic school pupils ____

2. Schools where programs took place:

Arsenal, Barnard-Brown, Batchelder, Burns, Clark, Fox Elem., Hooker, Jones, Rawson, Wish

Grade level breakdown for all pupils served:

Pk	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Other
				254	156									

3. Economic and educational criteria used to select pupils for services of the program: S.A.D.C. and Title I economic and educational criteria: See Page 2 of attached narrative.

4. Number and type of staff to whom SADC or Title I funds were paid:

1 Program Director, 3 Reading Consultants, 6 Teachers, 2 Secretaries

5. Principal objectives related to pupils' achievement and attitudes:

See narrative.

6. Description of program activities and services:

See narrative.

7. Evaluation of the principal goals of the program, measures used, results, and an interpretation of what the results mean.

See narrative.

8. Title I funds are provided to serve children from low-income areas regardless of whether they attend public or private schools. If children going to nonpublic schools resided in the school attendance areas validated for Title I, ESEA services in your community, provide the following:

   a. Where Title I services were rendered, indicate the number of children and the name(s) of the nonpublic schools they attended.

   b. Describe the specific services nonpublic school children received.

   c. Indicate the dollar amount of Title I, ESEA funds used for the above services.

9. Aside from the evaluation made of program objectives, indicate any <u>successful outcomes</u> resulting from Title I or SADC efforts in the town during the past year.

   See narrative.

10. Aside from the evaluation made of program objectives, indicate any <u>problems</u> resulting from Title I or SADC efforts in the town during the past year.

    See narrative.

11. State the <u>recommendations</u> for the future consideration of the programs. Base the recommendations on the findings and conclusions of this evaluation report.

    See narrative

12. Report the standardized test results for program pupils on the following pages. Report results so that pre- and post-test scores are for the <u>same</u> pupils. Report results for only those pupils who were administered the appropriate levels of the test for the pupil's school grade placement.

    The test results are organized to help in a statewide analysis of SADC and Title I. Report scores for a single subtest in reading, math, language where these are related to the program being offered. Note that group scores have been requested for specific grade levels only on page 4, while page 5 has been organized for all other test information which cannot be included on page 4.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

STANDARDIZED TEST INFORMATION FOR READING, MATH, AND LANGUAGE

Town Hartford Proj. # 64-1 Type Program Reading

Gr Lvl for Group Scores	Test Instrument Information: Name of Test and Year Published	Name of Subtest	Pre & Post Test Lvls	Pre & Post Test Forms	No. of Pupils Tested	Raw Scores and Grade Equivalence: Time of Pre Test*	Mean Scores r.s. / g.e.	Time of Post Test*	Mean Scores r.s. / g.e.
Reading									
Gr 1									
Gr 2									
Gr 3	CAT 70	Read	LP UP E / LP UP L	W x	319	*	2.4	*	3.2
Gr 4	CAT 70	Read		W x	200	*	2.5	*	3.2
Gr 5									
Gr 6									
Gr 7									
Gr 8									
Math									
Gr 1									
Gr 2									
Gr 3									
Gr 4									
Gr 5									
Gr 6									
Gr 7									
Gr 8									

					CA at Pre Test	Mean Scores r.s. / MA	CA at Post Test	Mean Scores r.s. / MA
Language								
Pk								
K								

*Record date of testing in grade equivalent units. If the pretest is between September 15 and Octo[illegible] ...1, for example. If ... post-test ... ...9. If during othe... use the same rationale.

... intervals (approximately)

... 5 - 6 ... mitted

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Instructions for Completing the Individual Pupil Information Form

Item 1 Responding SADC-Title I person: The teacher, aide, or teacher-aide team who provides supplementary services to educationally deprived pupils who are financed by the State Act for Disadvantaged Children or Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Item 2 School: The name of the school where compensatory services were provided by the SADC or Title I supported person or team or, the name of the school in the attendance area where those pupils who received help resided.

Item 3 Compensatory program title: The title or state project number of the compensatory program as indicated in the school district proposal and year-end evaluation.

Item 4 Town: The school district sponsoring the compensatory education program.

Item 5 Number of pupils receiving compensatory help: The total number of pupils who received compensatory services from the SADC or Title I supported person or team during the 1973-74 school year.

Item 6 Hours per week of compensatory help: The number of hours per week of compensatory services provided by the SADC or Title I supported person or team. Count only the hours of direct services provided. As a guide, the direct services provided by a classroom teacher average 25 to 30 hours per week.

Item 7 Total weeks of compensatory help: The total number of weeks during the 1973-74 year that compensatory services were provided by the SADC or Title I supported person or team. As a guide, schools are in session approximately 36 weeks per school year.

Item 8 Total cost for the compensatory help you provided: This is the estimated cost of duplicating your effort elsewhere. To approximate this cost, estimate the following and sum the amounts:

a. Your salary or salaries of the teacher-aide team (include fringe). $16,285

b. Estimate of 1973-74 cost of instructional supplies and equipment used to provide your compensatory help. $ 600

c. Estimate of travel or transportation cost financed by SADC or Title I. $ 375

d. Estimate of supervisory cost and teacher or aide training financed by SADC or Title I. $ 1,535

e. Other significant costs not included above needed to duplicate your effort elsewhere (exclude SADC-Title I expenditures of past years). $

A copy of the compensatory program line item budget should be [illegible] in estimating the above costs. Your SADC-Title I supervisor or director should be consulted about the total estimated cost of your effort.